



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/725,274

11/25/2003

Peter J. Ford

884A.0025.U1(US)

2959

29683 7590 04/10/2008
HARRINGTON & SMITH, PC
4 RESEARCH DRIVE
SHELTON, CT 06484-6212

EXAMINER

ELCENKO, ERIC J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2617

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

04/10/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/725,274	Applicant(s) FORD ET AL.	
	Examiner ERIC ELCENKO	Art Unit 2617	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 January 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 and 31-35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 and 31-35 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In regard to Claims 1, 12, 33 and 34, the applicant argues the address in Lin is not comparable to the address as claimed. The examiner disagrees. As discussed previously in the office action, the connection of two devices are made using destination addresses. The pathing information and how a call is routed is only known after a call is connected since roaming users and mobile devices are not stationary and can have different routing paths during various times of operation. Even stationary phones can have various routes to a destination for various reasons of network efficiency. Therefore, in response to the call being connected, the destination address of the second device is made know and the information of the second device can be used to deliver a data message. The connection of a call is considered a consequence of the communication since there is an effect of the communication connection.
2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 20 and 28 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lin et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2005/0096071) in view of Lielbriedis (U.S. Pub. No. 2001/0051528)

In regard to Claim 1, Lin et al. discloses a method of sending data from a first party participating in a telephone call to a second party in the telephone call (*Lin teaches a system and method for communicating data over a voice channel on a wireless device. The method includes establishing an audio connection with a second device providing an interface for a user for sending data to the second device (Abs)*)

Lin does not directly disclose storing an identifier and using the stored identifier to automatically determine a destination address for a data message. (Para 9)

Lielbriedis teaches identifying information is transmitted to a mobile communication station in the originating address data space of a short message. At a later stage when the mobile responds to the message, the received originating address will constitute the destination address and the identifying information will be returned from the mobile station in the destination address data space of the response. Lin teaches the transfer of data between the two stations and it can obviously be seen that the address of the two mobiles is being used in the exchange as destination addresses for the communication. Lielbriedis is used to show specifically that information in data communication is sent automatically in a response to the originating terminal which sent the data.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Lin to include the teachings of Lielbriedis in order to directly respond to the communicating

terminal using the original communication identification information as a destination address.

In regard to Claims 2-6, it is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that a identifier information that would be stored would be of the setup communication between the two terminals, including the telephone number, a CLI or equivalent.

In regard to Claims 7 and 8, Lielbriedis teaches storing the identifying information and being able to later retrieve the information for a response to the messages. (Para 9)

In regard to Claims 9 and 17, Lielbriedis discloses the destination address is any one of: an email address, a telephone number, a Bluetooth device address. (Para9, *it is also evident the connection is made in Lin by use of a telephone number between the devices*)

In regard to Claims 10-11, 18-19, Lin discloses providing, only during the telephone call a user selectable option to transfer data to the other party participating in the telephone call without user specification of a destination address. (*Lin teaches three options, one of which is sending data to the other party by selecting the option of pushing that particular button. The address of the participating party is not specified as the connection is already made and the address is known. (Para 35 – 39)*)

In regard to Claim 12, Lin et al. discloses a method of sending data from a first party participating in a telephone call to a second party in the telephone call (*Lin teaches a system and method for communicating data over a voice channel on a wireless device. The method includes establishing an audio connection with a second device providing an interface for a user for sending data to the second device (Abs)*)

Lin does not directly disclose storing an identifier and using the stored identifier to automatically determine a destination address for a data message. (Para 9)

Lielbriedis teaches identifying information is transmitted to a mobile communication station in the originating address data space of a short message. At a later stage when the mobile responds to the message, the received originating address will constitute the destination address and the identifying information will be returned from the mobile station in the destination address data space of the response. Lin teaches the transfer of data between the two stations and it can obviously be seen that the address of the two mobiles is being used in the exchange as destination addresses for the communication. Lielbriedis is used to show specifically that information in data communication is sent automatically in a response to the originating terminal which sent the data.

In regard to Claims 13 and 14, it is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that a identifier information that would be stored would be of the setup communication between the two terminals, including the telephone number received via the radio cellular transceiver, i.e., the call.

In regard to Claim 15, Lielbriedis teaches storing the identifying information and being able to later retrieve the information for a response to the messages. (Para 9)

In regard to Claim 16, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that each message stored from Lielbriedis and its associated identifying information would be connected to a different contact address as each is given a response to its respected received message.

3. Claims 20-29 and 30-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lin et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2005/0096071) in view of Lielbriedis (U.S. Pub. No. 2001/0051528) in further view of Hansmann et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2001/0016835)

In regard to Claim 20, Lin discloses while the telephone call is on-going, a user selectable option to transfer data to another party participating in the telephone call without user specification of a destination address. *(The user interface of Lin comprises 3 buttons, including a first button for sending (or pushing) data to the second terminal. In step 512, wherein button 410 for sending data was pressed, the wireless device 106 identifies the data for sending to the wireless device 108 and in step 513 the data is sent. (Para 38))*

Lin does not disclose a new channel that runs in parallel with a voice channel used for the telephone call.

Hansmann teaches during a voice channel connection, data being sent over a parallel data or service channel of the communication device. (Para 21)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Lin to include the teaching of Hansmann in order to provide a faster and more efficient method of transmitting a data message to another device by having a dedicated channel for data transmission without a further need for conversion for use with a voice communication channel.

In regard to Claim 21, 23, 25 and 29, Lin discloses being able to send phonebook entries, a calendar entry, a permission request, a text message, a V-card an application or the like. (Para 38)

In regard to Claim 22 and 30, the user pushes the send button, 410 and the information will be sent to the second terminal. (Para 38)

In regard to Claim 24, 31 and 35, Lielbriedis teaches storing the identifying information and being able to later retrieve the information for a response to the messages. (Para 9)

In regard to Claim 26, Lielbriedis discloses the destination address is any one of: an email address, a telephone number, a Bluetooth device address. (Para9, *it is also evident the connection is made in Lin by use of a telephone number between the devices*)

In regard to Claim 27, Lin discloses providing, only during the telephone call a user selectable option to transfer data to the other party participating in the telephone call without user specification of a destination address. (*Lin teaches three options, one of which is sending data to the other party by selecting the option of pushing that particular button. The address of the participating party is not specified as the connection is already made and the address is known.* (Para 35 – 39)

In regard to Claim 28, Lin et al. discloses a method of sending data from a first party participating in a telephone call to a second party in the telephone call (*Lin teaches a system and method for communicating data over a voice channel on a*

wireless device. The method includes establishing an audio connection with a second device providing an interface for a user for sending data to the second device (Abs))

Lin does not directly disclose storing an identifier and using the stored identifier to automatically determine a destination address for a data message. (Para 9)

Lielbriedis teaches identifying information is transmitted to a mobile communication station in the originating address data space of a short message. At a later stage when the mobile responds to the message, the received originating address will constitute the destination address and the identifying information will be returned from the mobile station in the destination address data space of the response. Lin teaches the transfer of data between the two stations and it can obviously be seen that the address of the two mobiles is being used in the exchange as destination addresses for the communication. Lielbriedis is used to show specifically that information in data communication is sent automatically in a response to the originating terminal which sent the data.

The combination does not disclose a new channel that runs in parallel with a v0oice channel used for the telephone call.

Hansmann teaches during a voice channel connection, data being sent over a parallel data or service channel of the communication device. (Para 21)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Lin to include the teaching of Hansmann in order to provide a faster and more efficient method of transmitting a data message to another device by having a dedicated channel for

data transmission without a further need for conversion for use with a voice communication channel.

In regard to Claim 32, it is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that a identifier information that would be stored would be of the setup communication between the two terminals, including the telephone number.

In regard to Claims 33 and 34, Lin et al. discloses a method of sending data from a first party participating in a telephone call to a second party in the telephone call (*Lin teaches a system and method for communicating data over a voice channel on a wireless device. The method includes establishing an audio connection with a second device providing an interface for a user for sending data to the second device (Abs)*)

Lin does not directly disclose storing an identifier and using the stored identifier to automatically determine a destination address for a data message. (Para 9)

Lielbriedis teaches identifying information is transmitted to a mobile communication station in the originating address data space of a short message. At a later stage when the mobile responds to the message, the received originating address will constitute the destination address and the identifying information will be returned from the mobile station in the destination address data space of the response. Lin teaches the transfer of data between the two stations and it can obviously be seen that the address of the two mobiles is being used in the exchange as destination addresses for the communication. Lielbriedis is used to show specifically that information in data

communication is sent automatically in a response to the originating terminal which sent the data.

Conclusion

4. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ERIC ELCENKO whose telephone number is (571)272-8066. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30 AM through 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Duc Nguyen can be reached on (571) 272-7503. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2617

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

ee

/Duc Nguyen/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2617